

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSITION **83**
Rebuttal To Proponents Arguments

The argument in favor of Proposition 83 ignores the sad lessons learned by other states. For example, the leading prosecutors' association in Iowa, which once urged the adoption of laws similar to Proposition 83, now argues that those laws be repealed because they have proven to be *ineffective, a drain on crucial law enforcement resources and far too costly to taxpayers*. California cannot afford to repeat that mistake.

The Proponents claim that the law is directed at "child molesters" and "dangerous sex offenders," but *its most punitive and restrictive measures would apply far more broadly: even to those convicted of misdemeanor, non-violent offenses*. They would also apply to people who have long led law-abiding lives for years after completing their sentences. More specifically, the Proposition would:

- Prohibit thousands of *misdemeanor offenders* from living near a school or park for the rest of their lives.
- Impose lifetime G.P.S. monitoring on first time offenders convicted of non-violent offenses. *For example, a 19 year old boy could be subjected to lifetime monitoring after a conviction for having sexual contact with his 17 year old girlfriend.*
- Impose both lifetime residence restrictions and lifetime G.P.S. monitoring on thousands of people who have lived law abiding lives for years or even decades.

These results are simply wrong.

Here's the bottom line. California has laws that protect us from Sexually Violent

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF
PROPOSITION 83

Predators, and this Initiative could have focused on such dangerous persons. But it does not! *Don't be fooled.* VOTE NO ON PROPOSITON 83.

_____/s/_____
Carleen R. Arlidge
President, California Attorneys for Criminal Justice

**SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES**